

Energy Splitting Theorems for Materials with Memory

Antonino Favata Paolo Podio-Guidugli Giuseppe Tomassetti

Dipartimento di Ingegneria Civile, Università di Roma Tor Vergata¹

Abstract

We extend to materials with fading memory and materials with internal variables a result previously established by one of us for materials with instantaneous memory: the additive decomposability of the total energy into an internal and a kinetic part, and a representation of the latter and the inertial forces in terms of one and the same mass tensor.

Keywords: Internal energy, kinetic energy, simple materials, fading memory, internal variables

1 Introduction

The purpose of this paper is to extend to two classes of materials with memory a result established in [6] for materials that, as exemplified by standard thermoelastic materials, can only respond to the current values of their state variables.

The result we aim to extend is called in [6] the Energy Splitting Theorem: it is shown that the (total) energy and the inertia force have consistent representations, under the assumptions that (i) the power expenditure of the inertia force be linear in the velocity; and that (ii) the inertial power plus the rate of change of the energy be translationally invariant. More precisely, it is shown that the energy can be split in two parts, *internal* and *kinetic*, with the internal energy independent of velocity and the kinetic energy a quadratic form in the velocity, based on a time-independent *mass tensor*, the same that determines also the work-effective part of the inertia force.

The two material classes we here consider are: the class of *simple materials* in the sense of Truesdell and Noll [8], whose mechanical response is determined by the history of the deformation gradient; and the class of materials with *internal state variables*, as considered e.g. by Coleman and Gurtin [2] and Lubliner [5], whose evolution is governed by a generally nonlinear differential equation (that the Energy Splitting Theorem had to be extendable to this material class was suggested by M.E. Gurtin in 1994, on reading a preprint of [6]). Since these two material classes have a nonempty intersection but do not overlap, we have to prove the entry part of our generalized Energy Splitting Theorem twice; we give the reasons for this at the end

¹Via Politecnico 1, 00133 Rome, Italy.

Email: favata@ing.uniroma2.it (A. Favata)

ppg@uniroma2.it (P. Podio-Guidugli)

tomassetti@ing.uniroma2.it (G. Tomassetti)

of next section. Luckily, as we shall see, the rest of the proof is not as sensitive to the chosen class.

Our paper is organized as follows. In Section 1, we introduce the quantities that are object of a constitutive prescription, we stipulate their invariance properties, and we summarize the Energy Splitting Theorem which we aim to generalize. In Section 2, we provide a constructive proof of the Energy Splitting Theorem under the assumption that the constitutive functionals be smooth relative to a norm having the fading-memory property. In Section 3, we sketch a proof of the Energy Splitting Theorem for materials with internal variables. Apart for some technicalities that we try and explain carefully when they come about, the structure of the proofs we give is the same as the variant of the proof in [6] given in [7].

2 Setting the stage

We work in a referential setting. To begin with, we introduce two scalar volume densities, of the (total) *energy*, denoted by τ , and of the *inertial power*:

$$\pi^{\text{in}} = \mathbf{d}^{\text{in}} \cdot \mathbf{v},$$

where $\mathbf{v}$ is the velocity vector and $\mathbf{d}^{\text{in}}$ is the *inertia force* vector. Next, we define the *internal power* density to be

$$\alpha = \dot{\tau} + \pi^{\text{in}} \quad (1)$$

(a superposed dot denotes time differentiation). Both τ and $\mathbf{d}^{\text{in}}$ are constitutively prescribed at a later stage. As now, it suffices for us to stipulate that, in principle, they both depend on one and the same list of *state variables*, that we split as follows: $(\Lambda, \mathbf{v})$, where the list Λ includes only *translationally invariant* variables. Precisely, a *translational change in observer* is a mapping leaving the time line unchanged:

$$(t, x) \mapsto (t, x)^+ = (t, x^+),$$

such that, at some fixed time $\bar{t}$, the current shape of the body under study is pointwise preserved, while the velocity field varies by a uniform amount:

$$\begin{aligned} x &\mapsto x^+ = x + (t - \bar{t})\mathbf{w}, \\ \mathbf{v} &\mapsto \mathbf{v}^+ = \mathbf{v} + \mathbf{w}, \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

for some fixed vector $\mathbf{w}$. Thus, as to state-variable pairs,

$$(\Lambda, \mathbf{v}) \mapsto (\Lambda, \mathbf{v})^+ = (\Lambda, \mathbf{v} + \mathbf{w}).$$

This is the result of [6] we generalize in the next two sections.

Energy Splitting Theorem. *Let the inertial power be linear in the velocity, in the sense that there is a mapping $\Lambda \mapsto \widehat{\mathbf{d}}_0(\Lambda)$, referred to as the work-effective inertia force mapping, such that*

$$\widehat{\mathbf{d}}^{\text{in}}(\Lambda, \mathbf{v}) \cdot \mathbf{v} = \widehat{\mathbf{d}}_0(\Lambda) \cdot \mathbf{v}, \quad \forall (\Lambda, \mathbf{v}). \quad (3)$$

Moreover, let the internal power be invariant under translational changes in observer:

$$\hat{\alpha}(\Lambda^+, \mathbf{v}^+) = \alpha^+ = \alpha = \hat{\alpha}(\Lambda, \mathbf{v}). \quad (4)$$

Finally, let the constitutive functions $\hat{\mathbf{d}}^{\text{in}}$ and $\hat{\tau}$ be, respectively, continuous and twice-continuously differentiable. Then, the energy τ and the inertial force $\mathbf{d}^{\text{in}}$ have consistent representations, parameterized by

(i) the mass tensor, a symmetric tensor $\mathbf{M}$, independent of $(\Lambda, \mathbf{v})$ and obeying the mass conservation law

$$\dot{\mathbf{M}} = \mathbf{0};$$

(ii) the internal energy, a scalar-valued mapping $\Lambda \mapsto \hat{\epsilon}(\Lambda)$ defined over the state space. These representations are:

$$\hat{\tau}(\Lambda, \mathbf{v}) = \tilde{\epsilon}(\Lambda) + \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{v} \cdot \mathbf{M} \mathbf{v}, \quad (5)$$

$$\tilde{\mathbf{d}}^{\text{in}}(\Lambda, \mathbf{v}) = -\mathbf{M} \dot{\mathbf{v}} + \tilde{\mathbf{D}}^{\text{in}}(\Lambda, \mathbf{v}) \mathbf{v}, \quad (6)$$

with $\tilde{\mathbf{D}}^{\text{in}}(\Lambda, \mathbf{v})$ a skew-symmetric tensor.

Note that (1), (3), and (2), imply that the invariance requirement (4) takes the form:

$$\frac{d}{dt} \left(\hat{\tau}(\hat{\Lambda}(t), \hat{\mathbf{v}}(t) + \mathbf{w}) - \hat{\tau}(\hat{\Lambda}(t), \hat{\mathbf{v}}(t)) \right) + \hat{\mathbf{d}}_0(\hat{\Lambda}(t)) \cdot \mathbf{w} = 0, \quad (7)$$

for every *constitutive process* $t \mapsto (\hat{\Lambda}(t), \hat{\mathbf{v}}(t))$ and for every vector $\mathbf{w}$. With this in mind, we are in a position to indicate why, in the last part of the Introduction, we stated that the entry part of the proof of a theorem of this sort depends on the material class for which it is meant to hold: the first and crucial step in the proof is to achieve a preliminary additive splitting of the energy into an internal part, that does not depend on velocity, and a kinetic part. To take that step, it is necessary to compute the derivative of $\hat{\tau}$ with respect to its first argument. This is easy in the case considered in [6]. Not so when, as we here do, the constitutive dependence of energy and work-effective inertia force on the current value of $\hat{\Lambda}$ is replaced by a functional dependence on the *history* of $\hat{\Lambda}$ up to time t , or by the current value of $\tilde{\Lambda} = (\hat{\Lambda}, \hat{\beta})^2$, with $\hat{\beta}$ a solution of the (generally nonlinear) ordinary differential equation governing the time evolution of a chosen list of *internal variables* β :

$$\dot{\beta} = \mathbf{f}(\Lambda, \beta).$$

Both replacements entail a rethinking of the structure of state space, as to the accessibility of its points and, more importantly, as to the possibility of giving any process an arbitrary short continuation in time.

We will discuss these technical issues at the appropriate stage of our developments.

²at any given body point: in this paper, we leave all space dependencies tacit.

3 Materials with fading memory

Our proof of an Energy Splitting Theorem for fading-memory materials is constructive, and is organized in four steps.

Step 1. Translational Invariance of the Internal Power. We let the space of the translationally invariant state variables be a open set C of a finite-dimensional inner product space L , and we denote by V the velocity space. Given a *state process* $\widehat{\Lambda}$ ($\equiv$ a smooth differentiable curve in C), its *history up to time t* is the mapping

$$\Lambda^t : [0, +\infty) \rightarrow C, \quad \Lambda^t(s) := \widehat{\Lambda}(t - s);$$

moreover, its *past history up to time t* is the restriction Λ_r^t of Λ^t to the open half-line $(0, +\infty)$, and its *instantaneous value* is $\Lambda^t(0) = \widehat{\Lambda}(t)$.

On adjourning the constitutive dependence of both energy and inertia force as appropriate to materials with fading memory, we set:

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\tau}_{\mathbf{v}}(t) &:= \hat{\tau}(\widehat{\Lambda}(t), \Lambda_r^t, \hat{\mathbf{v}}(t)), \\ \tilde{\mathbf{d}}_{\mathbf{v}}^{\text{in}}(t) &:= \widehat{\mathbf{d}}^{\text{in}}(\widehat{\Lambda}(t), \Lambda_r^t, \hat{\mathbf{v}}(t)), \\ \tilde{\mathbf{d}}_0(t) &:= \widehat{\mathbf{d}}_0(\widehat{\Lambda}(t), \Lambda_r^t), \end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

and we consistently adjourn assumption (3):

$$\tilde{\mathbf{d}}_{\mathbf{v}}^{\text{in}}(t) \cdot \hat{\mathbf{v}}(t) = \tilde{\mathbf{d}}_0(t) \cdot \hat{\mathbf{v}}(t). \tag{9}$$

Consequently, the invariance requirement (7) can now be written formally as follows:

$$\frac{d}{dt}(\tilde{\tau}_{\mathbf{v}+\mathbf{w}}(t) - \tilde{\tau}_{\mathbf{v}}(t)) + \tilde{\mathbf{d}}_0(t) \cdot \mathbf{w} = 0; \tag{10}$$

for it to have a precise mathematical sense, we have to specify the regularity of the functionals $\hat{\tau}$ and $\widehat{\mathbf{d}}_0$.

Step 2. Fading-Memory Property and Chain-Rule Formula. For $h : (0, +\infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ a non-negative measurable function chosen once and for all and such that

$$\int_0^{+\infty} |h(s)|^2 ds < +\infty,$$

we denote by L_r the Banach space of all measurable functions $\Lambda_r : (0, +\infty) \rightarrow L$, with the norm

$$\|\Lambda_r\| = \left(\int_0^\infty h(s) |\Lambda_r(s)|^2 ds \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}. \tag{11}$$

Two histories are close in the topology determined by the norm $\|\cdot\|$ if their values are close in the recent past no matter how far apart they are in the distant past. Thus, since the constitutive mappings are smooth, changing the history of $\widehat{\Lambda}$ in the distant past does not affect appreciably the instantaneous values of τ and $\mathbf{d}^{\text{in}}$. In Coleman and Noll's terminology [1, 8], introducing the norm $\|\cdot\|$ endows material class with the *Fading-Memory Property*.

We let the domain of the functional $\widehat{\mathbf{d}}_0$ be an open subset $\mathcal{C}$ of the Banach space $\mathcal{L} = L \oplus L_r$, and we let the common domain of functionals $\hat{\tau}$ and $\widehat{\mathbf{d}}^{in}$ be $\mathcal{C} \oplus V$. Moreover, we require that $\widehat{\mathbf{d}}^{in}$ be continuous and $\hat{\tau}$ be twice-continuously Fréchet differentiable.

As pointed out in Remark 1 of [3], the continuous differentiability of $\hat{\tau}$ and the smoothness of $t \mapsto \widehat{\Lambda}(t)$ guarantee that the time derivatives in (10) are well defined, and that the following “Chain-Rule Formula” holds true:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} \tilde{\tau}_{\mathbf{v}}(t) &= \partial_{\Lambda} \hat{\tau}(\Lambda(t), \Lambda_r^t, \mathbf{v}(t)) \cdot \dot{\Lambda}(t) \\ &\quad + \delta_r \hat{\tau}(\Lambda(t), \Lambda_r^t, \mathbf{v}(t)) [\dot{\Lambda}_r^t] + \partial_{\mathbf{v}} \hat{\tau}(\Lambda(t), \Lambda_r^t, \mathbf{v}(t)) \cdot \dot{\mathbf{v}}(t). \end{aligned}$$

Here $\partial_{\Lambda} \hat{\tau}$ and $\partial_{\mathbf{v}} \hat{\tau}$ are the partial derivatives of $\hat{\tau}$ with respect to its first and third argument, respectively, and $\delta_r \hat{\tau}$ is the unique bounded linear functional on L_r satisfying

$$\hat{\tau}(\Lambda, \Lambda_r^t + \Phi_r, \mathbf{v}) = \hat{\tau}(\Lambda, \Lambda_r^t, \mathbf{v}) + \delta_r \hat{\tau}(\Lambda, \Lambda_r^t, \mathbf{v}) [\Phi_r] + o(\|\Phi_r\|) \quad \forall \Phi_r \in L_r.$$

By combining the invariance requirement (10) with the Chain-Rule Formula, we obtain an expression involving both the instantaneous value and the past history of the time derivative of the state process $\widehat{\Lambda}$:

$$\begin{aligned} &\left(\partial_{\Lambda} \hat{\tau}(\widehat{\Lambda}(t), \Lambda_r^t, \widehat{\mathbf{v}}(t) + \mathbf{w}) - \partial_{\Lambda} \hat{\tau}(\widehat{\Lambda}(t), \Lambda_r^t, \widehat{\mathbf{v}}(t)) \right) \cdot \dot{\Lambda}(t) \\ &+ \left(\delta_r \hat{\tau}(\widehat{\Lambda}, \Lambda_r^t, \widehat{\mathbf{v}}(t) + \mathbf{w}) - \delta_r \hat{\tau}(\widehat{\Lambda}, \Lambda_r^t, \widehat{\mathbf{v}}(t)) \right) [\dot{\Lambda}_r^t] \\ &+ \left(\partial_{\mathbf{v}} \hat{\tau}(\widehat{\Lambda}, \Lambda_r^t, \widehat{\mathbf{v}}(t) + \mathbf{w}) - \partial_{\mathbf{v}} \hat{\tau}(\widehat{\Lambda}, \Lambda_r^t, \widehat{\mathbf{v}}(t)) \right) \cdot \dot{\mathbf{v}}(t) + \widehat{\mathbf{d}}_0(\widehat{\Lambda}, \Lambda_r^t) \cdot \mathbf{w} = 0. \end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

Step 3. Energy Splitting. As in [6] for instant-memory materials, we achieve the desired result for materials with fading memory by showing that $\partial_{\Lambda} \hat{\tau}$ does not depend on $\mathbf{v}$.

The argument used in [6] relies on the existence, given an arbitrary Ω in L , of a state process $\widehat{\Gamma}$ whose instantaneous value coincides with $\widehat{\Lambda}(t)$, and whose rate $\dot{\Gamma}(t)$ equals Ω ; by replacing $\widehat{\Lambda}$ with $\widehat{\Gamma}$, and by invoking the arbitrariness of Ω , one deduces that the term multiplying $\dot{\Lambda}(t)$ in the first line of (12) must vanish, and then concludes that $\partial_{\Lambda} \hat{\tau}$ does not depend on $\mathbf{v}$. The argument we use in the present proof is similar, and is based on a result due to Coleman and Mizel [3, Remark 2]: *for every positive ε , there is a state process ${}^{\varepsilon}\widehat{\Gamma}$ such that*

$$\begin{aligned} {}^{\varepsilon}\dot{\Gamma}(t) &= \Omega, \\ |\widehat{\Lambda}(t) - {}^{\varepsilon}\widehat{\Gamma}(t)| &< \varepsilon, \end{aligned}$$

whose past history ${}^{\varepsilon}\Gamma_r^t(\cdot)$ satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Lambda_r^t - {}^{\varepsilon}\Gamma_r^t(\cdot)\| &< \varepsilon, \\ \|\dot{\Lambda}_r^t - {}^{\varepsilon}\dot{\Gamma}_r^t(\cdot)\| &< \varepsilon. \end{aligned}$$

Replacing $\widehat{\Lambda}$ with ${}^{\varepsilon}\widehat{\Gamma}(\cdot)$ in (12), letting ε vanish, and using the smoothness of $\hat{\tau}$ and $\widehat{\mathbf{d}}^{in}$, we obtain

$$\left(\partial_{\Lambda} \hat{\tau}(\widehat{\Lambda}(t), \Lambda_r^t, \widehat{\mathbf{v}}(t) + \mathbf{w}) - \partial_{\Lambda} \hat{\tau}(\widehat{\Lambda}(t), \Lambda_r^t, \widehat{\mathbf{v}}(t)) \right) \cdot \Omega + \dots = 0 \tag{13}$$

(the dots stand for the remaining terms of (12)), whence, by the arbitrariness of Ω ,

$$\partial_\Lambda \hat{\tau}(\hat{\Lambda}, \Lambda_r^t, \hat{\mathbf{v}}(t) + \mathbf{w}) - \partial_\Lambda \hat{\tau}(\hat{\Lambda}, \Lambda_r^t, \hat{\mathbf{v}}(t)) = \mathbf{0}, \quad \text{for all } \mathbf{w} \text{ in } V, \quad (14)$$

that is to say, as anticipated, $\partial_\Lambda \hat{\tau}$ does not depend on the velocity. By (14), we conclude that the constitutive mapping that delivers the total energy splits as follows:

$$\hat{\tau}(\hat{\Lambda}(t), \Lambda_r^t, \hat{\mathbf{v}}(t)) = \hat{\epsilon}(\hat{\Lambda}(t), \Lambda_r^t) + \hat{\kappa}(\Lambda_r^t, \hat{\mathbf{v}}(t)). \quad (15)$$

Step 4. Representations of Kinetic Energy and Inertial Force. By (15), relation (12) becomes:

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(\delta_r \hat{\kappa}(\Lambda_r^t, \hat{\mathbf{v}} + \mathbf{w}) - \delta_r \hat{\kappa}(\Lambda_r^t, \hat{\mathbf{v}}) \right) [\dot{\Lambda}_r^t] + \left(\partial_{\mathbf{v}} \hat{\kappa}(\Lambda_r^t, \hat{\mathbf{v}} + \mathbf{w}) - \partial_{\mathbf{v}} \hat{\kappa}(\Lambda_r^t, \hat{\mathbf{v}}) \right) \cdot \dot{\mathbf{v}} + \\ & + \hat{\mathbf{d}}_0(\hat{\Lambda}(t), \Lambda_r^t) \cdot \mathbf{w} = 0 \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

(the dependence of $\mathbf{v}$ and $\dot{\mathbf{v}}$ on t has been left tacit).

By assumption, both mappings $(\Lambda, \Lambda_r^t, \mathbf{v}) \mapsto \delta_r \hat{\tau}(\Lambda, \Lambda_r^t, \mathbf{v})[\cdot]$, and $(\Lambda, \Lambda_r^t, \mathbf{v}) \mapsto \partial_{\mathbf{v}} \hat{\tau}(\Lambda, \Lambda_r^t, \mathbf{v})$ are continuously differentiable, hence³;

$$\partial_{\mathbf{v}}(\delta_r \hat{\tau}(\Lambda, \Lambda_r^t, \mathbf{v})[\Phi_r]) = \delta_r(\partial_{\mathbf{v}} \hat{\tau}(\Lambda, \Lambda_r^t, \mathbf{v}))[\Phi_r]. \quad (17)$$

On differentiating (16) with respect to $\mathbf{w}$ and using (17) we obtain:

$$\delta_r \partial_{\mathbf{v}} \hat{\kappa}(\Lambda_r^t, \hat{\mathbf{v}} + \mathbf{w})[\dot{\Lambda}_r^t] + \partial_{\mathbf{v}\mathbf{v}} \hat{\kappa}(\Lambda_r^t, \hat{\mathbf{v}} + \mathbf{w}) \dot{\mathbf{v}} + \hat{\mathbf{d}}_0(\hat{\Lambda}(t), \Lambda_r^t) = \mathbf{0}. \quad (18)$$

Upon choosing $\hat{\mathbf{v}} = -\mathbf{w}$ in (18), we have

$$\delta_r \partial_{\mathbf{v}} \hat{\kappa}(\Lambda_r^t, \mathbf{0})[\dot{\Lambda}_r^t] + \partial_{\mathbf{v}\mathbf{v}} \hat{\kappa}(\Lambda_r^t, \mathbf{0}) \dot{\mathbf{v}} + \hat{\mathbf{d}}_0(\hat{\Lambda}(t), \Lambda_r^t) = \mathbf{0}. \quad (19)$$

Finally, on subtracting (19) from (18) and selecting $\mathbf{w} = \mathbf{0}$, we obtain:

$$\left(\delta_r \partial_{\mathbf{v}} \hat{\kappa}(\Lambda_r^t, \hat{\mathbf{v}}) - \delta_r \partial_{\mathbf{v}} \hat{\kappa}(\Lambda_r^t, \mathbf{0}) \right) [\dot{\Lambda}_r^t] + \left(\partial_{\mathbf{v}\mathbf{v}} \hat{\kappa}(\Lambda_r^t, \hat{\mathbf{v}}) - \partial_{\mathbf{v}\mathbf{v}} \hat{\kappa}(\Lambda_r^t, \mathbf{0}) \right) \dot{\mathbf{v}} = \mathbf{0}. \quad (20)$$

Since the choice of $\dot{\mathbf{v}}$ is arbitrary, we conclude that

$$\hat{\kappa}(\Lambda_r^t, \mathbf{v}) = \frac{1}{2} \hat{\mathbf{v}} \cdot \widehat{\mathbf{M}}(\Lambda_r^t) \hat{\mathbf{v}}, \quad (21)$$

where the map $\widehat{\mathbf{M}}(\Lambda_r^t)$ takes its values in the space of second-order symmetric tensors. By combining (15) and (21), we arrive at

$$\hat{\tau}(\hat{\Lambda}, \Lambda_r^t, \mathbf{v}) = \hat{\epsilon}(\hat{\Lambda}, \Lambda_r^t) + \frac{1}{2} \hat{\mathbf{v}} \cdot \widehat{\mathbf{M}}(\Lambda_r^t) \hat{\mathbf{v}}, \quad (22)$$

an additive energy splitting that generalizes the one in (5).

³The identity (17) generalizes the theorem on the inversion of the order of partial differentiation for functions of real variables [4].

Substituting (21) into (20), we obtain

$$\delta_r \widehat{\mathbf{M}}(\Lambda_r^t) [\dot{\Lambda}_r^t] = 0, \quad (23)$$

and, by (19),

$$\widehat{\mathbf{d}}_0(\widehat{\Lambda}, \Lambda_r^t) = -\widehat{\mathbf{M}}(\Lambda_r^t) \dot{\mathbf{v}}.$$

From the linearity in the velocity of the power expenditure of inertia force, we obtain the generalization of (6) going alongside with (22):

$$\widehat{\mathbf{d}}^{in}(\widehat{\Lambda}, \Lambda_r^t, \dot{\mathbf{v}}) = \widehat{\mathbf{d}}_0(\widehat{\Lambda}, \Lambda_r^t) + \widehat{\mathbf{D}}^{in}(\widehat{\Lambda}, \Lambda_r^t, \dot{\mathbf{v}}) \dot{\mathbf{v}}, \quad (24)$$

where $\widehat{\mathbf{D}}^{in}(\widehat{\Lambda}, \Lambda_r^t, \dot{\mathbf{v}})$ is a skew-symmetric tensor. Finally, for $\mathbf{M}(t) = \widehat{\mathbf{M}}(\Lambda_r^t)$, the Chain-Rule Formula and (23) yield:

$$\dot{\mathbf{M}}(t) = 0. \quad (25)$$

We are now in position to wrap up our findings and state our

Energy Splitting Theorem for Materials with Fading Memory. *Let the constitutive dependence of energy and inertia be specified by (8)_{1,2} and let the set of past histories be endowed with the fading memory norm defined in (11). Moreover, let the mappings $(\widehat{\Lambda}, \Lambda_r^t, \mathbf{v}) \mapsto \widehat{\mathbf{d}}^{in}(\widehat{\Lambda}, \Lambda_r^t, \mathbf{v})$ and $(\widehat{\Lambda}, \Lambda_r^t, \mathbf{v}) \mapsto \hat{\tau}(\widehat{\Lambda}, \Lambda_r^t, \mathbf{v})$ be, respectively, continuous and twice-continuously differentiable.*

Assume that:

- (i) *the inertial power admit the representation (9);*
- (ii) *the total energy satisfy the invariance requirement (10).*

Then, $\widehat{\mathbf{d}}^{in}$ and $\hat{\tau}$ admit the representations (22) and (24), parameterized by a symmetric-valued tensor mapping $\Lambda_r^t \mapsto \widehat{\mathbf{M}}(\Lambda_r^t)$, and a scalar mapping $(\widehat{\Lambda}, \Lambda_r^t) \mapsto \hat{\epsilon}(\widehat{\Lambda}, \Lambda_r^t)$. Moreover, the mass tensor $\mathbf{M}(t) = \widehat{\mathbf{M}}(\Lambda_r^t)$ obeys the conservation law (25).

4 Materials with internal variables

For materials with internal variables, the total energy, the inertia force, and the work-effective part of the inertia force are given by

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\tau}_{\mathbf{v}}(t) &:= \hat{\tau}(\widehat{\Lambda}(t), \boldsymbol{\beta}(t), \dot{\mathbf{v}}(t)), \\ \tilde{\mathbf{d}}_{\mathbf{v}}^{in}(t) &:= \widehat{\mathbf{d}}^{in}(\widehat{\Lambda}(t), \boldsymbol{\beta}(t), \dot{\mathbf{v}}(t)), \\ \tilde{\mathbf{d}}_0(t) &:= \widehat{\mathbf{d}}_0(\widehat{\Lambda}(t), \boldsymbol{\beta}(t)), \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

where $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ is a translationally-invariant vector of internal variables, whose evolution is ruled by the ordinary differential equation:

$$\dot{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(t) = \mathbf{f}(\Lambda(t), \boldsymbol{\beta}(t)). \quad (27)$$

By (26) and (27), the invariance statement (7) leads to

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left(\partial_{\Lambda} \hat{\tau}(\hat{\Lambda}(t), \boldsymbol{\beta}(t), \hat{\mathbf{v}}(t) + \mathbf{w}) - \partial_{\Lambda} \hat{\tau}(\hat{\Lambda}, \boldsymbol{\beta}(t), \hat{\mathbf{v}}(t)) \right) \cdot \dot{\Lambda}(t) \\
& + \left(\partial_{\boldsymbol{\beta}} \hat{\tau}(\hat{\Lambda}(t), \boldsymbol{\beta}(t), \hat{\mathbf{v}}(t) + \mathbf{w}) - \partial_{\boldsymbol{\beta}} \hat{\tau}(\hat{\Lambda}, \boldsymbol{\beta}, \hat{\mathbf{v}}) \right) \cdot \mathbf{f}(\Lambda(t), \boldsymbol{\beta}(t)) \\
& + \left(\partial_{\hat{\mathbf{v}}} \hat{\tau}(\hat{\Lambda}(t), \boldsymbol{\beta}(t), \hat{\mathbf{v}}(t) + \mathbf{w}) - \partial_{\hat{\mathbf{v}}} \hat{\tau}(\hat{\Lambda}(t), \boldsymbol{\beta}(t), \hat{\mathbf{v}}(t)) \right) \cdot \dot{\mathbf{v}}(t) \\
& + \hat{\mathbf{d}}_0(\hat{\Lambda}(t), \boldsymbol{\beta}) \cdot \mathbf{w} = 0.
\end{aligned} \tag{28}$$

By a continuation argument borrowed from [6], the time derivative $\dot{\Lambda}(t)$ appearing in the first line of (28) can be replaced with an arbitrary rate Ω ; the resulting relation allows one to conclude that

$$\partial_{\Lambda} \hat{\tau}(\hat{\Lambda}(t), \boldsymbol{\beta}(t), \hat{\mathbf{v}}(t) + \mathbf{w}) - \partial_{\Lambda} \hat{\tau}(\hat{\Lambda}(t), \boldsymbol{\beta}(t), \hat{\mathbf{v}}(t)) = \mathbf{0} \quad \text{for all } \mathbf{w} \text{ in } V,$$

whence the splitting:

$$\hat{\tau}(\hat{\Lambda}, \boldsymbol{\beta}(t), \hat{\mathbf{v}}(t)) = \hat{\epsilon}(\hat{\Lambda}(t), \boldsymbol{\beta}(t)) + \hat{\kappa}(\boldsymbol{\beta}(t), \hat{\mathbf{v}}(t)).$$

From this point on, the proof proceeds along the steps listed in the previous section, with $\boldsymbol{\beta}(t)$ in the place of Λ_r^t . The conclusions are, *mutatis mutandis*, the same as those stated in the Energy Splitting Theorem for materials with fading memory: the total energy and the inertial force admit the representations:

$$\hat{\tau}(\hat{\Lambda}, \boldsymbol{\beta}, \hat{\mathbf{v}}) = \hat{\epsilon}(\hat{\Lambda}, \boldsymbol{\beta}) + \frac{1}{2} \hat{\mathbf{v}} \cdot \widehat{\mathbf{M}}(\boldsymbol{\beta}) \hat{\mathbf{v}},$$

$$\hat{\mathbf{d}}^{\text{in}}(\hat{\Lambda}, \boldsymbol{\beta}, \hat{\mathbf{v}}) = -\widehat{\mathbf{M}}(\boldsymbol{\beta}) \dot{\mathbf{v}} + \widehat{\mathbf{D}}^{\text{in}}(\hat{\Lambda}, \boldsymbol{\beta}, \hat{\mathbf{v}}) \hat{\mathbf{v}},$$

with $\widehat{\mathbf{M}}(\boldsymbol{\beta})$ symmetric and $\widehat{\mathbf{D}}^{\text{in}}(\hat{\Lambda}, \boldsymbol{\beta}, \hat{\mathbf{v}})$ skew; the mass tensor $\mathbf{M}(t) = \widehat{\mathbf{M}}(\boldsymbol{\beta}(t))$ satisfies the conservation law (25).

References

- [1] B.D. Coleman, W. Noll, An Approximation Theorem for Functionals, with Applications in Continuum Mechanics, Arch. Rat. Mech. Anal., 6, 355-370 (1960)
- [2] B.D. Coleman, M. Gurtin, Thermodynamics with Internal State Variable, J. Phys. Chem., 47, 597-613 (1967)
- [3] B.D. Coleman, V.J. Mizel, A General Theory of Dissipation in Materials with Memory, Arch. Rat. Mech. Anal., 27, 255-274 (1967)
- [4] L.M. Graves, Riemann Integration and Taylor's Theorem in General Analysis, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc., 29, 163-177 (1927)
- [5] J. Lubliner, On Fading Memory in Materials with Evolutionary type, Acta Mech., 8, 75-81 (1969)

- [6] P. Podio-Guidugli, Inertia and Invariance, *Ann. Mat. Pur. Appl.*, CLXXII, 103-124 (1997)
- [7] P. Podio-Guidugli, *Sparse Notes in Thermodynamics*. Forthcoming (2009)
- [8] C. Truesdell, W. Noll, The Non-Linear Field Theories of Mechanics, in S. Flugge, *Encyclopedia of Physics*, vol. III/3, Springer (1965)